

REMARKS

Claims 1-62 are pending. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, and 18 have been amended, claims 24-62 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 62-100 have been added. Support for the amendment claim 1 can be found in Fig. 1 and the accompanying descriptions. Claim 16 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of original claim 1. Claims 3 and 18 have been amended in accordance with Fig. 1 and the accompanying descriptions. Added independent claim is the same as original claim 7. Support for the added claims can be found at page 10, lines 5-15 (claims 1 and 82); page 11, 3rd paragraph (63); page 11, lines 29-30 (86); claim 3 (84); page 12, first paragraph (76, 85, 87); page 16, lines 15-16 (18, 91); page 16, lines 23-25 (88-89); page 17, lines 16-17 (90); page 18, line 14 – page 19, line 1 (6, 65-73, 94-95); page 19, lines 11-12; page 22, lines 3-8 (96-98); and page 23, lines 1-7 (74-76, 80, 93, 99) and elsewhere in the specification. These claims do not present new matter and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

There appears to be some confusion regarding the prior restriction requirement. Applicants understand the prior requirement as a restriction, not an election of species requirement. Therefore, applicants have canceled the claims that were not elected without traverse (claims 24-62). Further, applicants agree that there is a patentable distinction between the elected claims and nonelected claims 10-15, and will agree to cancel claims 10-15 if necessary to expedite prosecution of the elected claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims over Tonkovich '536. It may be mentioned that the PCT counterpart of this patent published more than a year prior to the filing date of the instant application and therefore qualifies as prior art under section 102(b). Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a space separates the combustion catalyst and the second plate". No such space is taught or suggested in the cited Tonkovich patent. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection in view of Tonkovich is respectfully requested.

With regard the section 103 rejection, the cited '844 patent discloses a wick that draws water into a cooling channel for evaporative cooling. Thus, the '844 patent is the opposite of the inventive microcombustor in which a wick is present in the exhaust channel to assist in removing water. The evaporative cooler taught in the '844 patent would be counter-productive for use in the exhaust channel of a microcombustor. Therefore, the section 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions or would like to speak to Applicants' representative, the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicants' attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2 Dec. 2007

send correspondence to:
Frank Rosenberg
18 Echo Hill Lane
Moraga CA, 94556

By: Frank S. Rosenberg

Frank S. Rosenberg
Registration No. 37,068
tel: (925) 376-8416